Conflict-of-Interest in the Senate, P. 4

Associate of Paul Nitze at Foreign Relations Hearing Opposes A NATO Nuclear Deterrent, See Page 3.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, No. 6 FEBRUARY 13, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Fresh Breezes Everywhere But The State Department

A fresh wind is blowing through the capital, and fresh minds and a new accessibility are evident everywhere—except in the State Department. Even at the Pentagon, the dinosaur of our bureaucracy, the new Secretary of Defense and his press relations chief, Arthur Sylvester, have begun to let fresh air in on a stale atmosphere. The one place where nothing seems to change but the decor, which is plush and modernistic, is at the State Department. Pleasant but conventional are the adjectives which best describe the new Secretary of State's first press conference. There could hardly be a greater contrast than that between the incisive brisk vigor of the Kennedy press conferences* and the long-winded caution of Dean Rusk's. It is true that he appears in the shadow of a strong President, obviously determined to be his own Secretary of State, and in the midst of slow deep changes, like the breakup of the ice in a clogged river after a long winter, when he cannot be sure of his footing. Nonetheless for all his protective banality, and non-committal care, Mr. Rusk was revealing.

Misrepresenting the Geneva Accords

There was, for example, his remark when asked about the arms being supplied from both sides in the Laotian struggle. "The assistance which we have given in Laos," Mr. Rusk said, "has been channeled through the arrangements which were set up under the Geneva accords." John Foster Dulles himself could not have been more disingenuous. It *is* possible by legalistic contortions to find loopholes in the Geneva accords for limited military assistance to Laos, but the accords never envisaged the kind of operation under which we have poured millions of dollars worth of military supplies into Laos, and made it a military satellite of the United States. The Geneva accords envisaged a neutralized Laos and Cambodia. That is why neither was included in SEATO and why we had to disguise our military mission to Laos as a Programs Evaluation Office with its U.S. officers in civilian clothes. The trouble in Southeast Asia stems from Mr. Dulles's determination to undercut the Geneva accords, first by preventing the promised elections to unify Vietnam and secondly to upset the results of the elections which had unified Laos and brought the Pathet Lao into a coalition Cabinet. Until we face up to the bankruptcy of this policy in Laos, no real progress can be made in pacifying the area.

Then there was the revealing way Mr. Rusk answered the question about whether he thought "perhaps Mr. Lumumba should be released from prison shortly and even be permitted to take a high place?" Mr. Rusk downgraded Lumumba by lumping him with other prisoners. "I would not wish," he said, "to comment on the very difficult problem of the release of political prisoners. There are a considerable number of them being held." But Mr. Lumumba is no ordinary political prisoner. He was the Prime Minister who called on the United Nations for help only to be thrown in prison, and then kidnapped and handed over to his worst enemies in Katanga just when Mr. Hammarskjold is reported to have gotten a promise from President Kasavubu to release him for participation in the January 25 round table conference (see London *Sunday Times* Jan. 15). In the eyes of black Africa, Lumumba is a martyr, a symbol of white perfidy, the legitimate Prime Minister of the Congo, punished because he would not knuckle under to Belgian imperialism. Mr. Rusk referred to the efforts of the Conciliation Commission without mentioning the fact that it was denied access to Mr. Lumumba, the most important figure to be conciliated. The gap between the way the Afro-Asians (even our close friends, the Liberians) see Lumumba and our over-simplified picture of him as "Left-leaning" must be closed if there is to be peace in the Congo. To the Afro-Asians, our unwillingness to see Parliament convened lest it reinstate Lumumba as Prime Minister makes our rhetoric about freedom and representative government seem hypocritical.

Effective leadership requires public education; the ignorance of the American public about Laos, the Congo and Cuba is so great that it hampers a shift toward more flexible and realistic policies. Some plain and honest speaking is required. By this standard Mr. Rusk was most disappointing on Cuba. His prepared statement was downright inane when it said that among "the most promising activities" in Latin America "is the growing scientific and technical exchange among the Latin American countries themselves." When he was asked to fix responsibility for what he delicately referred to as "the earlier neglect of the aspirations of the Cuban people," Mr. Rusk replied that "the primary responsibility, of

(Continued on page Two)

Everybody's Armament Sugar Daddy

"Another delicate aspect of the U.S. role in Laos is the amount of American military equipment that has fallen into the hands of the pro-Communist Pathet Lao rebels. . . . Until recently most of the military equipment in rebel hands was American made, much of it captured by pro-Communist forces in neighboring North Vietnam during the Indo-China war."

—Associated Press from Vientiane, Wash. Star, Feb. 5.

***Mr. Kennedy's third as we were going to press was something of a letdown, partly because of the poor questions asked him but mostly because of his failure to speak out on the shameful white boycott of New Orleans' schools. Here, for the first time, he fumbled and bumbled like his predecessor when asked to bring the moral weight of his office to bear.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Ideas Available (But Ignored) for Africa and Southeast Asia

(Continued from page One)

course, goes to these previous regimes in Cuba," although he did "think that the rest of us in the Inter-American system might have worked harder to point that and and other governments in the direction of economic and social reform." This bland nonsense will infuriate Latin American opinion which remembers the Machado and Batista regimes as our creation and sees the hostility we show (only as recently as El Salvador) to every regime which points toward economic and social reform. The emphasis on self-help, the failure even to mention land reform, will not make friends for the new Secretary below the Rio Grande. His description of the kind of "total national effort under vigorous leadership" needed in Latin America fits the Castro regime better than any other, and his complaint about the "wide-spread conservatism" which blocks progress in Latin America will give him a reputation as a humorist. Mr. Rusk seems to be saying that the *campesinos* should be more radical.

Muntinous U.S. Military in Laos

Mr. Rusk announced that for the first time in history a President had come over to the State Department and sat in on a Secretary's morning staff conference. Mr. Kennedy will have to sit in oftener if he is to move the State Department out of its deep and complacent cold war groove. Except for Mr. Bowles and Mr. Stevenson, there are no New Frontiersmen in the State Department; men like McGeorge Bundy, W. W. Rostow and Jerome Wiesner, who might have energized the Department, have been shunted off to the White House where they form what may become a rival foreign policy organization. It is encouraging to see that the President is taking a hand on his own, seeing the Ambassadors from Laos, the Congo and Afghanistan, dropping in unexpectedly at State. This is his most urgent but his most difficult area of action; in the domestic field, he has organized allies in labor, among ethnic groups and in the farm country, but in foreign policy the country at large offers only an unorganized and uninformed anxiety to support his efforts. The bureaucracy is hostile to negotiation; Clare Timberlake, our Ambassador to the Congo, came back from Leopoldville to lobby on the Hill and among the press for "strong" policies; he is pro-Belgian, pro-Mobutu, and pro-Tshombe, an envoy made to order for *Union Miniére du Haut Katanga* which has just reported *(New York Times,* Feb. 8) a banner year of copper output despite the convulsions elsewhere. In Laos, there are similar obstacles to new policies. From Vientiane the *London Times* reported Jan. 30 that one of the U.S. officers attached to the Laotian forces said "the only possible solution was to crush the Pathet Lao by force, and added that if the new Administration in Washington changed this policy, he and other officers would resign."

In a capital so full of idea men, it is striking how few new ideas are visible in foreign policy. Yet ideas are at hand, ignored, to provide a large framework for the Congolese and Laotian problems. Senator Mansfield's great but disregarded speech on Africa last August (see this *Weekly* for Sept. 5) would forestall future African crises (Angola may be next) by a Soviet-American agreement to neutralize the Continent, forego military bases anywhere on it, and join through the UN in economic development. A similar grand design for Southeast Asia was put forward (and similarly disregarded) at the UN in September by Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia (see the *Weekly* of last Oct. 10) when he called on the powers to make a neutralized buffer zone of his country and Laos. It is by such large and foresighted measures, and not by stumbling from crisis to crisis, that the U.S. may regain respect and initiative.

Where The Dollars Are Wasted

The President's special message on the balance of payments hardly touches on the two root problems. One is the huge outlay—about $3 billion a year—on military expenditures abroad, most of it wastefully spent by our profligate military, and utilized for private profit by cynical allies riding the cold war gravy train. The other is the torrential flow of U.S. capital abroad to areas where it is least needed, namely Western Europe and especially Germany. We are glad to see that Mr. Kennedy has asked the Secretary of the Treasury to report by April 1 "on whether present tax laws may be stimulating" this outflow "in undue amounts." In 1960, according to a German survey (AP from Frankfurt, Washington Star, Feb. 4), one-half of all U.S. investments abroad went to Europe and from 1955-59 one-third of the $8.3 billion invested by Americans in the common market went to West Germany "where they employed about half a million German workers at wages averaging 50 cents an hour." Cheap labor and tax benefits enable these branch plants to undercut American exports abroad; resentment is built up against U.S. ownership in Britain and Germany. While we fight socialist measures in the underdeveloped countries, U.S. capital goes elsewhere. Sooner or later, either by revision of the tax laws or investment controls, the government will have to take steps to redirect the flow of capital.

Governor Nelson of Wisconsin Denounces Un-American Activities Committee

Madison, Wis.—Gov. Nelson said Tuesday that the attack by Rep. Walter (D. Pa.) on critics of the House Committee on Un-American Activities 're-enforces the arguments of those who advocate abolition of this committee.' Walter had denounced a group that published a newspaper advertisement calling for abolition. Walter said the signers included Communists, pro-Communists and those who travelled in strange company.

The signers included Mrs. Esther Kaplan, Gov. Nelson's private secretary, and several Wisconsin professors and clergymen. Nelson was asked at his press conference Monday to comment, but said he had not studied Walter's statement.

He said Tuesday that Walter's charges against 'nine respected citizens of Wisconsin who chose to express their views on a public question, were 'irresponsible and unwarranted.' 'It is my opinion that the actions of this committee have served to violate constitutional rights of freedom of speech and of assembly,' Nelson said. 'In an effort to combat a system that denies these freedoms, the committee has undermined the very freedoms that most sharply distinguish our democracy from the Communist system.'

He said he would ask Wisconsin Democratic Congressmen to 'vote against the continuation of this committee when the occasion arises.' —*Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 31.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Associate of Paul Nitze Opposes Giving NATO Strategic Nuclear Arms

The press seems to have missed the strong position against a so-called independent NATO nuclear deterrent taken by Arnold Wolfers, director of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, Johns Hopkins University, at a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Feb. 3. His testimony was given enhanced interest because it may throw light on the views held by Paul H. Nitze, whom President Kennedy has appointed Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. The topic of the hearing was a report prepared for the Senate Committee by the Washington Center on "Developments in Military Technology and Their Impact on U.S. Strategy and Foreign Policy." Mr. Nitze and James E. King, Jr., as Research Associates of the Center worked with Mr. Wolfers on this report. Their report favored creation of a balanced nuclear deterrent rather than disarmament though Mr. Wolfers admitted that such a balance was precarious. The Kennedy administration is now being pressed to ask Congress to authorize the Norstad plan for a nuclear NATO. Should it do so, it will place strategic nuclear arms in the hands of the Germans and torpedo hopes for disengagement and disarmament. We present key excerpts from the testimony:

Mr. WOLFERS: To supply our NATO allies, individually or as a group, with *strategic* nuclear capability did not seem to us a viable solution from either a military or a political viewpoint. Instead, the report advocated a substantial increase in conventional forces. . . .

"What we are not able to spell out today is a program that would make our allies feel sufficiently secure to remain our allies . . . not because they do not think this country has great determination to help its allies, but they ask themselves: Would we commit suicide for Berlin . . .?

"And now the Germans back General Norstad with the idea (of) . . . a NATO deterrent. . . . Now, we took the view, and I still hold to the view, that this is a false road, to try to substitute for the American deterrent or to try to find a means of triggering the American deterrent. . . .

A Futile Military Policy

"My fear is, however, that if we play with this idea . . . It will again give them the idea that somehow one can get around strong shield forces which they dislike to set up, and escape into the happier realm of a few big strategic weapons . . . and they will discover after a while that they are back again where they are today, after having diverted their main resources into this futile attempt. . . .

"I am afraid that a discussion of a collective deterrent is going to lead to considerable political trouble . . . because the question arises: Who is going to push the button? . . . Is Turkey going to push the button, or allow Norway to push the button, if one or the other is attacked? . . .

"I am rather sorry that this was thrown into the debate the last months of the last administration, and that the new administration may find its hands tied in a way because psychologically this has now stirred up a hornet's nest. . . .

"Nuclear power is a very powerful thing. I think it needs a very strong, unified, civilian authority. I can see no such authority except the President of the United States. . . .

"The Germans say: 'You have got to give us tactical nuclear weapons. We cannot be a second class army.' This, I think, is inevitable, and I do not see anything we can do about preventing that kind of a spread, except by some arms control, denuclearization control, or something of that kind.

Behind the Cloak of NATO

"The strongest backer [for the plan to give NATO its own nuclear deterrent] and the nation with the most to gain is West Germany, whose program for a 1,000-plane combat jet air force by the middle 1960s will make it the strongest force on the west European continent. This force hardly can be effective in full fledged combat unless nuclear weapons are immediately available. . . . On the other hand, any direct proposal to grant the Germans as a national force—which they insist they are not—use of nuclear weapons would create the immediate possibility of unresolvable debates in most west European capitals and possibly the United States itself. The Germans are careful to point out that their forces—air, ground and sea—are NATO, not West German. . . . West German pilots already are being trained in nuclear delivery techniques at a special weapons training site outside Germany."

—Aviation Week, Dec. 5, 1960.

What I do think these countries ought to realize is that to set up a strategic nuclear arm that could sufficiently knock out the Russians to deter the Soviet Union—but this is beyond their reach. I think the British are beginning to see that it is even beyond their reach. . . ."

Senator SYMINGTON: But would that small country—would they not feel much more secure from the standpoint of their being attacked, although of course they could be destroyed, if they could in turn destroy, for example, several cities in Russia? . . ."

Mr. WOLFERS: Yes, But the Russians would only be deterred by something that makes some sense to do, and if Switzerland or Denmark can knock out Moscow, in return the Russians, even after having lost Moscow, would knock the whole country out of this earth. . . .

"I do not think we can prevent some of our allies, we have not prevented it, and I do not see how we can, from producing a small supply of weapons of their own over which they will have control. I do not know how the Russians would prevent the Chinese from doing it, if the Chinese ever reach that point, and they probably will and very soon.

"But when it comes to the use of our own strategic force or of that part of the strategic force which, in terms of vehicles, we put at the disposal of our allies, I do not think this country should give up its key. I think two keys is the only safety we can have. I do not think we can allow them to trigger us into a nuclear war. . . .

Senator SYMINGTON: "I was interested in this double veto; you call it two keys. I think Schelling calls it the double veto. There is no way to stop these people from using this bomb, if they wanted to, practically speaking, is there?"

Mr. WOLFERS: No. They could grab it and use it.

Senator SYMINGTON: They do not have to grab it because they have got it. I have seen it. It is on their bases, not ours. They outnumber us, I would say, guessing, 100 to 1, and we have very, very few people there, so the 100 to 1 figure even indicates that the decision is not ours in finality at all, is it, if they want to do it?

Mr. WOLFERS: They would hesitate, of course, to push the American soldier aside and say: "Give us that key".

Senator SYMINGTON: I understand that, but, nevertheless. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Way to Disarmament Might Be Cleared If Private Interests Were Disclosed

Why Should Senators Be Exempt from Conflict-of-Interest Safeguards?

The double standard applied by Congress to conflicts of interest was displayed again when the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee approved the nomination of James E. Webb to be the new head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Mr. Webb was required to divest himself of all connections with two companies interested in the space programs. He had been a director of the McDonnell Aircraft Corporation of St. Louis, which manufactures the Mercury man-in-space capsule and he had also been assistant to the president of Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc.

But no such divestment was required of Senator Robert S. Kerr (*D. Okla*), chairman of the board of Kerr-McGee, when he succeeded Lyndon Johnson as chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Committee a few weeks earlier. The chairmanship of the Space committee is at least as influential a job and calls for decisions which may affect the earnings of Senator Kerr's oil company.

Making Divestment A Farce

Mr. Webb has no special qualifications for the NASA job; he was director of the Budget Bureau under Mr. Truman. According to the *Washington Post* (Jan. 31) he was recommended for NASA by Senator Kerr and Lyndon Johnson. Kerr was able to put an employe into the most important civilian space job in the administration soon after taking over the space committee chairmanship. The divestment of interest required of Mr. Webb takes on elements of farce in this context.

Kerr-McGee Oil is a major factor in uranium. Of $1.5 billion worth of uranium to be bought by the AEC by the end of 1956 (see AEC press release C-277 last Nov. 18), almost one-fifth or $292,000,000 will be purchased from a Kerr-McGee subsidiary, Kermac Nuclear Fuels Corporation. This is the largest of the AEC's 27 domestic uranium contracts. In addition Kerr-McGee has an interest in two other uranium contracts, a $25,000,000 one held by Petrotomics, a partnership of Kerr-McGee with three other oil companies, Skelly, Tidewater and Getty, and a $14,500,000 contract for ore from a Kerr-McGee processing mill at Shiprock, New Mexico.

The Conclusions Seem to Be Ready Even Before the Study Begins

Dallas, Tex.—Air Research and Development Command has set up a committee of about 15 prominent scientists and industrialists to take a fresh, completely uninhibited view of the U.S. Air Force space programs . . . ARDC Commander Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever revealed. . . . This report will provide the Air Force with a major tool in promoting a much stronger and wider-based military space program. . . . The Air Force will seek a much larger role in the national space program than it has been permitted in the past because of previous emphasis by top U.S. leadership on space efforts directed toward scientific and peaceful pursuits. The report is also to be made available to the National Space Council, Gen. Schriever noted, and he expects that under the strong leadership of Vice President Lyndon Johnson, there should be 'favorable changes' in the Air Force position as well as the civilian programs.

—Aviation Week and Space Technology, Jan. 23

The market for uranium will be affected by the advent of nuclear propulsion for rockets, by the extent of space exploration (which promises to be fabulously expensive), and by whether we allow the military to make space a new and more costly dimension of the arms race. All these matters will come before the Space committee which Senator Kerr heads. In addition, his vote as a Senator on such matters as a nuclear test treaty, further nuclear weapons stockpiling and disarmament will affect his uranium interests. He is in as influential a position as a Cabinet officer, and with similar access to profitable information. Why should he be exempt from conflict-of-interest safeguards?

In the Wilson administration, tariff reform was brought about after every Senator was required to appear before a Judiciary subcommittee and disclose his private interests in tariff changes and the lobbyists with whom he had discussed them. The way might well be cleared for disarmament, if every Senator were similarly required to declare his private interests in the arms race.

In Renewing Ask for the 1960 Index, But Please Send Stamped Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

2/13/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED